



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/884,477	06/20/2001	Gunther L. Brenes	53470.003008	9574

7590 11/20/2003

Brian M. Buroker
Hunton & Williams
Suite 1200
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER

LU, KUEN S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2177

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

M

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/884,477

Applicant(s)

BRENES ET AL.

Examiner

Kuen S Lu

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 15 objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. In Claim 15, "The method of claim 1" should read "The method of claim 13".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1-3, 9-10, 13-15, 21-22 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Selvarajan et al. (U.S. Patent 6,279,033, hereafter "Selvarajan").

As per claims 1, 13 and 25, Selvarajan teaches the following:

"a user interface" at col. 4, lines 29-30 by presenting a user interface to a user; and

"a reporting server" at col. 4, lines 38-40 by using the server system of the OLAP system at col. 4, lines 38-39, "communicating with the user interface" at col. 4, lines 31-35 by receiving user's request and returning control to the user, "the reporting server being configured to

respond to user input to manipulate at least one report generated from at least one data source by accessing an image of the at least one report" at col. 4, lines 31-35 by user to submit another report request without waiting for the completion of the initial request, and "generating present results to present via the user interface" at col. 4, lines 40-42 by getting report delivered to or retrieved by the user.

As per claims 2, 14 and 26, Selvarajan teaches the following:

"at least one report comprises an image stored in at least one of an electronic memory" at col. 9, lines 40-43 by storing reports on cache, and "a storage medium of the reporting server" at col. 10, lines 65-66 by using server cache to store calculated report results.

As per claims 3 and 15, Selvarajan teaches "a network server, the reporting server communicating with the user interface via the network server" at col. 10, lines 62-63 by providing a network server to generate output from network output module across network to user system.

As per claims 9 and 21, Selvarajan teaches "at least one data source comprises at least one OLAP enabled database" at col. 15, lines 37-44 by using ROLAP architecture on server system and RDBMS in data warehouse.

As per claims 10 and 22, Selvarajan teaches "the results presented to the user are modifiable" at col. 13, lines 25-29 by allowing administrator to filter, cancel or modify reports.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 4-5, 8,16-17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Selvarajan et al. (U.S. Patent 6,279,033) as applied to claims 1-3 and 13-15 above, and further in view of Hsiao et al. (U.S. Pub. 2002/0083058, hereafter "Hsiao").

As per claims 4 and 16, Selvarajan does not teach "network server, comprises a Web server".

However, Hsiao teaches network server comprising a Web server at Page 3, [0028] by having server computing system to take the form of network server such as Web server.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Hsiao's teaching into Selvarajan's by using network server to server as Web server because by doing so Network and Web services would be integrated into a single hardware system and operating software bundle such that no additional hardware would be needed and communications between the two servers would be eliminated, since the hardware or software resource needed to support the two services is minimal.

As per claims 5 and 17, Selvarajan teaches the following

"translate the user input received via the user interface via first network (Fig. 5, elements 26, 29 and 36) enabled code to second network (Fig. 5, elements 36 and 42) enabled code" at col. 11, lines 36-45 by configuring network server to present user with a view by using user interface module, allow user to use the module to submit request for reports and communicate the request to network output module;

"access the at least one data resource via the second network enabled code" at Fig. 5, elements 22, 14 and 12, and col. 11, lines 45-48 by formulating report request to server system for processing against a data warehouse; and

"present results to the user via the first network enabled code" at col. 12, lines 3-8 by presenting the report to user through network output module.

As per claims 8 and 20 Selvarajan teaches "user interface comprises a Web browser" at col. 3, lines 22-24 by enabling user to access information using a network interface device, for example, a Web browser.

3. Claims 6-7 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Selvarajan et al. (U.S. Patent 6,279,033) in view of Hsiao et al. (U.S. Pub. 2002/0083058), as applied to claims 4-5 and 16-17 above, and further in view of Lampson et al. (U.S. Patent 6594672, hereafter "Lampson").

As per claims 6-7 and 18-19, Selvarajan-Hsiao combination does not teach network enabled code to comprise "HTML Code" or "XML code".

However, Lampson teaches XML to fit in with the OLAP metadata and HML to display XML document at col. 8, lines 38-45 by pointing out that raw XML documents having

hierarchical structure storing data definition as opposed to format tags used in HTML document, geared towards displaying content.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Hsiao-Lampson's combined teaching into Selvarajan's by using HTML code to request OLAP report and obtaining XML document for the result because its well known practice in the field of internet programming and would further ensure the use of same data format.

4. Clams 11-12 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Selvarajan et al. (U.S. Patent 6,279,033) as applied to claims 1, 10, 13 and 15 above, and further in view of Nwabueze. (U.S. Pub. 2002/0144174).

As per claim 11 and 23, Selvarajan does not teach the modifying the result of the cube data.

However, Nwabueze teaches "the modifications to the results comprise at least one of a table pivot, a pageby, a recalculated sum and a recalculated sort" at Page 8, [0074], lines 7-10 by allowing customer to modify the presentation of data in an OLAP cube in order to examine multiple business metrics for previously undetected relationship.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Nwabueze's teaching into Selvarajan's by allowing user to further modify the result cube because by doing so the presentation of report would be more flexible to fit business metrics for undetected relationship.

As per claims 12 and 24, Selvarajan does not teach modifying results being activated by URL link or query box.

However, Nwabueze teaches "the modifications to the results are activated by at least one of a URL link and a query box" at Page 8, [0075], lines 14-16 and Page 5, [0054], lines 17-20 by referring URLs in the page view and referring Query Wizard, respectively.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Nwabueze's teaching into Selvarajan's by allowing users better equipped to modify the end-result because by doing so analysts and managers would gain insight into data through fast, consistent, interactive access to a wide variety of possible views of information that has been transformed from raw data to reflect the real dimensionality of the enterprise as understood by the user.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

- A. U.S. Patent No. 6279033
- B. U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0083058
- C. U.S. Patent No. 6594672
- D. U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0144174

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U. Oracle, Oracle9i OLAP, A Scalable Web_Based
Business Intelligence Platform, An Oracle White Paper,
April 2001

V. Oracle, Oracle9i OLAP Services, Concepts and
Administration Guide, Release 1 (9.0.1), June 2001

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuen S Lu whose telephone number is 703-305-4894. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

KL

Patent Examiner

November 14, 2003


JOHN BREENE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100